## 2011 Child Support Workgroup Post Secondary Educational Support Subcommittee Telephone Meeting June 16th, 2011 Notes

**Present:** Chair Tim Eastman and Andrew McDirmid. George Smylie (DSHS/DCS support staff) Greg Howe (member of public)

The telephone conference commenced at 4:15 p.m. on June 16th, 2011. Chair Tim Eastman had provided an agenda for the meeting via email to the members sent June 9th, 2011.

Subcommittee members discussed the Word Document Draft of recommended changes to the Postsecondary Education Support statute. The members present feel that if support is suspended, the support should be re-established the payment the monthly payment after the adult child can show he or she can meet the requirements of section (3) of RCW 26.19.090 based on the status of the child at the end of the semester or quarter when new grades are available.

Members present agree that there should be a maximum number of times the adult child fails to meet the requirements of the statute. Members present feel that the second time should terminate the parents' responsibility to continue Postsecondary support as these are Adults.

Members feel that in section (6) of the statute that any payments be made to the school or child only. We should remove the ability to make payments to the other parent altogether. This is to include Room and Board even if the child resides with one of the parents. Members feel that the child can make required payments to whomever, even the parent with whom they live.

The subcommittee members feel that we must ensure that the requirements for the parents to "petition the court prior to the child's 18th Birthday or the child graduates whichever is later" be required by statute.

All members present feel that there must be a minimum obligation for their own education that the adult child must be required to provide. This can be in the form of financial aid and /or working to provide for their share of expenses. The parents' obligation should be shared after all financial aid including is accounted for. Any support should be based on in-state tuition.

The subcommittee discussed how any postsecondary savings or funding should be treated in regard to postsecondary educational support. The members present agree that any funding pre-paid either to the education facility or child shall be deducted from that parent's obligation and shall be treated as a monthly payment with regard to other children. One example is Millman vs. Josephson, where the supported adult child should be included as a child when determining support for minor children. (i.e. where there are two minor children and one adult child receiving postsecondary educational support, child support for the minor children will be based on three children in the economic table.)